

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 30, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 30, 2003. In a telephone interview on November 18, 2003, the Examiner and the Applicant could not reach an agreement. An interview summary accompanies this response. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's courtesy for scheduling and conducting the interview.

Claims 1-32 and 34-36 are pending in the application. Claims 1-32 and 34-36 are rejected. Applicant proposes amending claims 11 and 21 to incorporate the subject matter of claims 12 and 23, respectively. These amendments do not raise new issues since claims 11 and 21 as amended are identical to pending claims 12 and 23. Applicants further cancel claims 12, 16-20, 22-23, and 26-32 without prejudice to eliminate the issues or preclude raising new issues. Claims 13 and 24-25 are amended to depend on claims 11 or 21 since the claims originally depended on the subject matter of claims 12 or 23 which are incorporated into claims 11 or 21. Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amendments do not introduce new matter or new issues, and place the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4, 11, 14-15, 21, and 24-25 as amended stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Although the Examiner asserts that "substantially tangent" is indefinite, Applicant has learned from the telephone interview summarized in an accompanying document that the Examiner actually is asserting that the claims are not properly limited to the inner surfaces of the side walls being substantially tangent to the inner surfaces of the cylindrical regions as shown in Figs. 3 and 6A-6C. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on grounds that Applicant uses the term substantially tangent in reference to definition of an inner volume as explained in the attached Interview Summary and that only the inner surfaces of the side walls and cylindrical regions define the inner volume. The Examiner errs in asserting that the inner volume can also be defined by the outer

surfaces of the side walls and cylindrical regions because the outer surfaces do not define the inner volume. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,730,801 (*Tepman, et al.*). Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tepman, et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,820,723 (*Benjamin, et al.*). Claims 5-11, 13-15, 21, and 24-25 as amended stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tepman, et al.* in view of European Patent No. EP 0814495 (*Shen, et al.*). Claims 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tepman, et al.* in view of *Shen, et al.*, and further in view of *Benjamin, et al.* Applicant respectfully submits that each of these rejections erroneously rely on *Tepman*, which the Examiner asserted during the recent interview teaches outer surfaces of side walls and outer surfaces of cylindrical regions that are substantially tangent. The position taken by the Examiner erroneously ignores the claim language which specifies that the configuration of the side walls and cylindrical regions defines an inner volume. The inner volume taught by Applicant is inherently defined by the inner surfaces of the recited components and cannot be defined by the outer surfaces as asserted by the Examiner. Entry of this amendment and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims as amended is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the invention of the claims as amended. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSEY, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)